

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed on August 29, 2007, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. Claims 1-37 are now pending in this Application. Claims 1, 18 and 35-37 are independent claims and the remaining claims are dependent claims. In this Amendment, claims 2, 8, 19 and 25 have been amended and claims 38-42 have been added. Applicants believe that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance. A notice to this affect is respectfully requested.

AMENDMENTS TO CLAIMS 8 AND 25

Claims 8 and 25 have been amended to fix a minor typographically error and respectfully request entry of these changes as indicated above.

OBJECTIONS TO CLAIMS

Claim 2 is objected to for not being clear as to the classification of severity value, severity level, severity scale and severity ranking. Applicants have amended claim 2 to better clarify these terms.

In general, a severity level represents a range of consecutive severity values such that a given event (e.g., alert message) has a corresponding severity level when the severity value for the given event is within the range of severity values of the corresponding severity level. For example, FIG. 10 of the Specification shows that a particular severity level (e.g., "Warning") has a corresponding severity value range (e.g., 4000-6000). Thus, an alert message having a corresponding severity value of, say, 4500, would also have a corresponding "Warning" severity level since 4500 is within the severity level range of 4000-6000.

A severity scale, on the other hand, is a value that represents an enumeration or aggregation of events (e.g., alert messages) for a given node entry. In calculating the severity scale for a given node entry, the severity level of each respective event is also taken into account such that each event is weighted according to its severity level.

A severity ranking is an ordering (e.g., descending or ascending order) of severity scales for each corresponding node entry. Therefore, to further clarify this

distinction, a *severity ranking* represents an ordering of severity scales, while a *severity level* represents a range of severity values.

Since claim 19 has the same or similar limitations as claim 2, this claim has also been amended for the reasons stated above.

Applicants submit that no new matter has been added.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1-13, 18-30 and 35-37 rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2006/0173992 A1 (Weber et al.) in view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0210791 A1 (Akagawa). Applicants respectfully disagree with these contentions and assert that all claims are in condition for allowance.

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner relies heavily on the art disclosed in Weber et al.; specifically, FIG. 29, Element 304, and paragraph [0195]. Applicants note that, although Weber et al. does not pre-date filing of this application, Weber et al. does claim priority to earlier-filed U.S. Provision App. No. 60/423,557 (filed Nov. 4, 2002), U.S. Provisional App. No. 60/427,294 (filed Nov. 18, 2002) and U.S. Provisional App. No. 60/429,050 (filed Nov. 25, 2002). Thus, only subject matter disclosed in these earlier-filed provisional applications would qualify as prior art.

In reviewing the above-mentioned provisional applications, Applicants were unable to find reference to, either explicitly or implicitly, the subject matter used for rejecting claim 1; specifically, subject matter relating to FIG. 29, Element 304, and paragraph [0195] in Weber et al. Without such support in these earlier-filed provisional applications, Applicants contend that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is untenable.

If the rejection of claim 1 is to be maintained, Applicants respectfully request that it be pointed out with particularity where the cited prior art, namely the above-mentioned provisional applications, teaches the limitations of independent claim 1.

For the reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn. Accordingly, claim 1 is in allowable condition.

-15-

Applicants' other independent claims 18 and 35-37 contain the same or similar limitations as those found in claim 1 and discussed above. Thus, independent claims 18 and 35-37 are also allowable for the same reasons as described in reference to claim 1.

Further, as Applicants' dependent claims 2-17 and 19-34 depend from allowable independent claims 1 and 18, respectively, these dependent claims are themselves also allowable and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

NEWLY ADDED CLAIMS

Claims 38-42 have been added and are believed to be in allowable condition. Claims 38, 39, 40, 41 and 42 depend from independent claims 1, 18, 35, 36 and 37, respectively. Support for claims 38-42 is provided within the Specification, for example, on page 11 and page 18. Applicants submit that no new matter has been added. The prior art of record fails to disclose or suggest the subject matter of the newly added claims.

Applicant(s) hereby petition(s) for any extension of time which is required to maintain the pendency of this case. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-3735.

-16-

If the enclosed papers or fees are considered incomplete, the Patent Office is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned collect at (508) 616-9660, in Westborough, Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted,

/JCS/

Jonathan C. Siekmann, Esq.
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No.: 58,259
Chapin Intellectual Property Law, LLC
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581
Telephone: (508) 616-9660
Facsimile: (508) 616-9661

Attorney Docket No.: EMC03-12(02169)

Dated: November 15, 2007